United States Court of Appeals For the Eighth Circuit

No. 13-1125

Steven Anthony Sera

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Greg Harmon; James Gibson; Jeremy Andrews

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas - Little Rock

Submitted: September 23, 2013 Filed: October 4, 2013 [Unpublished]

Before MURPHY, COLLOTON, and GRUENDER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Arkansas inmate Steven Sera brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that defendants violated his rights under the First Amendment when they denied him a

Appellate Case: 13-1125 Page: 1 Date Filed: 10/04/2013 Entry ID: 4082712

publication that had been sent to him from outside the prison.¹ The district court² granted defendants' motion for summary judgment, concluding that they were entitled to qualified immunity. Sera appeals. Having carefully reviewed the record de novo and considered Sera's arguments for reversal, we agree with the district court's reasons for granting summary judgment to defendants on the claim. *See Thornburgh v. Abbott*, 490 U.S. 401, 414-19 (1989); *Winslow v. Smith*, 696 F.3d 716, 730-31 (8th Cir. 2012) (standard of review); *Murphy v. Mo. Dep't of Corr.*, 372 F.3d 979, 983, 986 (8th Cir. 2004) (appellate court conducts independent review of evidence to determine whether there has been exaggerated response to concerns of prison, but accords great deference to judgment and expertise of prison officials, particularly on decisions implicating institutional security).

| Accordingly, | the judgment | t is affirmed | d. See 8 | 8th Cir. | R. | 47B. |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------|----------|----|------|
| | | | | | | |

¹Sera raised other claims in his complaint, but in his appellate brief, he does not contest their disposition. *See Griffith v. City of Des Moines*, 387 F.3d 733, 739 (8th Cir. 2004) (claims not briefed on appeal are deemed abandoned).

²The Honorable Joe J. Volpe, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, to whom the case was referred for final disposition by consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).